

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-17 are pending. Claims 6 stand rejected. Claims 7-11 have been objected to.

Claims 12-17 are withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8 have been amended. Claims 7 and 12 – 17 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant(s) submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Restriction Requirements

The Office Action has required restriction to one of the inventions in this application under 35 USC §121. The Applicants affirm election to prosecute claims 6-11 without traverse.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Frenkel et al U.S. Patent No. 6,538,454, (“Frenkel”). The Examiner stated that

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Frenkel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,454). With regard to Claim 6, Frenkel et al. discloses a testing system comprising: a network analyzer (82) having a radio frequency out port (port connected to 80) and a radio frequency in port (port connected to 30); a first coaxial cable (80) having a first end connected to the radio frequency out port (port connected to 80) and a second end (connected to 72); a radio frequency test probe (50) having a first end (72) electrically coupled to the second end (connected to 72) of the first coaxial cable (80) and a second end (58); and adapter (70) having a first end (72) in contact with the second end (connected to 72) of the radio frequency test probe (50) and a second end (connected to 52); and a second coaxial cable (52) having a first end (top of 52) connected to the second end (connected to 52) of the adapter (70) and a second end (72) in communication with the radio frequency out port (port connected to 80); wherein the first coaxial cable (80), the radio frequency test probe (50), the adapter (70), and the second coaxial cable (52) all have the same impedance. See Figs. 4 and 10.

(p. 2-3, Office Action 7/14/04)

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, is not anticipated by Frenkel under 35 U.S.C. 102§(e). Amended claim 6 includes the following limitations:

A testing system comprising:

- a network analyzer having a radio frequency out port and a radio frequency in port;

- a first coaxial cable having a first end electrically coupled to the second end of the first coaxial cable and a second end;

- a radio frequency test probe having a first end electrically coupled to the second end of the first coaxial cable and a second end;

- an adapter having a first end in contact with the second end of the radio frequency test probe and a second end, the adapter including a ground sleeve having a first ground sleeve end adapted to contact a ground lead of a coaxial cable, a second ground sleeve end adapted to contract a ground probe of the test probe, a signal pin positioned inside of and spaced apart from the ground sleeve, the signal pin having a first signal pin end adapted to contact a signal lead of a coaxial cable and a second signal pin end adapted to contact a signal probe of the test probe; and

- a second coaxial cable having a first end connected to the second end of the adapter and a second end in communication with the radio frequency out port;

wherein the first coaxial cable, the radio frequency test probe, the adapter, and the second coaxial cable all have the same impedance.

(Amended claim 1) (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Frenkel fails to disclose the limitation of an adapter including a ground sleeve having a first ground sleeve end adapted to contact a ground lead of a coaxial cable, a second ground sleeve end adapted to contract a ground probe of the test probe, a signal pin positioned inside of and spaced apart from the ground sleeve, the signal pin having a first signal pin end adapted to contact a signal lead of a coaxial cable and a second signal pin end adapted to contact a signal probe of the test probe.

For these reasons applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is not anticipated by Frenkel, as noted by the Examiner. Given that claims 8 – 11 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 6, applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 – 11 are, likewise, not anticipated by Frenkel.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/6/04

By: 

Tom Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8598